

Density expansion for the mobility of electrons in Helium gas

K.I.Wysokinski
Institute of Physics,
M.Curie-Sklodowska University,
20-031 Lublin, Poland
and
Materials Science Institute
University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403

Wansoo Park and D.Belitz
Department of Physics and Materials Science Institute,
University of Oregon,
Eugene, OR 97403

T.R.Kirkpatrick
Institute for Physical Science and Technology,
University of Maryland,
College Park, MD 20742
 (February 1, 2008)

Abstract

We calculate the electron mobility for a quantum Lorentz model, which provides a realistic description of electrons in Helium gas, to second order in the gas density. We show that this provides sufficient theoretical information to allow for an experimental observation of the famous logarithmic term in the density expansion. Detailed predictions, and a discussion of a suitable parameter range, for such an experiment are given.

PACS numbers: 51.10+y, 05.60+w

The absence of a virial expansion for transport coefficients [1] has become famous as one of the surprises in Theoretical Physics [2]. For the sake of definiteness, let us consider the example of a tagged particle in a fluid. If one tries to expand the diffusion coefficient, D , in powers of the fluid density, n , for a d -dimensional system one encounters a nonanalyticity of the form $n^{d-2} \ln n$. This is true for both classical [1] and quantum mechanical [3] tagged particles. An analogous term is found in other transport coefficients. The existence of this nonanalyticity, and its relation to the long-time tail in the velocity autocorrelation function, is well established theoretically through many calculations for various systems and models [4]. It also has been seen in computer simulations of the classical $2-d$ Lorentz model of a particle moving in a random environment of uncorrelated hard disk scatterers [5]. In real experiments, however, the effect has so far not been convincingly observed [4].

Considering the fundamental importance of the theoretical prediction, and the substantial interest it has generated over almost thirty years, the absence of an experimental confirmation is somewhat surprising. There are many reasons for this failure. (1) Logarithmic terms on top of an analytic background are notoriously hard to detect. (2) The coefficients in the density expansion of the transport coefficients of classical fluids are known, or have been estimated, only for hard-sphere model fluids, not for realistic interaction potentials [4]. (3) These estimates indicate that in classical fluids the coefficients of the analytic terms are in general large compared to those of the nonanalytic ones. (4) $2-d$ systems, in which the nonanalytic term is the leading correction to the Boltzmann value, are hard to realize classically, while the $2-d$ quantum case is greatly complicated by localization effects and not understood theoretically [6]. Below we will show that $3-d$ quantum systems do not suffer from the problems (2) - (4), and are therefore the most promising candidates for an experimental observation of the nonanalyticity.

A particularly promising system consists of electrons injected into Helium gas of density n [7]. The electron-Helium scattering process is well known, and its characteristics are convenient from a theoretical point of view. The scattering length, $a_s = 0.63\text{\AA}$, is positive, and for thermal electrons the energy dependence of the scattering cross section is negligible. Since the electrons behave quantum mechanically, the thermal wavelength, $\lambda = (2\pi^2\hbar^2\beta/m)^{1/2}$, with $\beta = 1/k_B T$ and m the electron mass, provides an additional length scale besides a_s and the mean Helium atom separation $n^{-1/3}$. The leading parameter in the density expansion is $na_s^2\lambda = \lambda/4\pi l$ [8], with $l = 1/4\pi na_s^2$ the mean free path, and a_s/λ serves as an additional small parameter. The mass ratio $m_{He}/m \approx 10^4$ makes it a good approximation to treat the Helium atoms as static scatterers. Finally, the low density of the injected electrons allows one to neglect Coulomb interaction effects between the electrons. An experiment [7] which measures the mobility of the electrons (which is related to the diffusion coefficient by an Einstein relation) thus constitutes an almost ideal realization of a $3-d$ quantum Lorentz model.

The density expansion for the $3-d$ quantum Lorentz model has been considered in Refs. [8,9]. It is convenient to calculate the conductivity, σ , of degenerate electrons at $T = 0$, and then to convert to the experimentally relevant finite- T mobility by means of an Einstein relation and a Kubo-Greenwood formula. The leading terms in the expansion for σ are,

$$\sigma = \sigma_B \left[1 + \sigma_1 \frac{1}{2k_F l} + \sigma_{2\log} \left(\frac{1}{2k_F l} \right)^2 \ln \left(\frac{1}{2k_F l} \right) + \sigma_2 \left(\frac{1}{2k_F l} \right)^2 + O(a_s/l) + o(1/(k_F l)^2) \right] , \quad (1a)$$

with

$$\sigma_1 = -4\pi/3 \quad , \quad (1b)$$

$$\sigma_{2log} = (\pi^2 - 4)/2 \quad . \quad (1c)$$

Here k_F is the Fermi wave number, and $\sigma_B = e^2 k_F^2 l / 3\pi^2 \hbar$ is the Boltzmann conductivity with e the electron charge. $a_s k_F$ is considered small, and $o(\epsilon)$ denotes terms that vanish faster than ϵ . The coefficient σ_2 of the analytic term at second order is not known.

Adams *et al.* [10] have used Eqs.(1) to analyze experimental data obtained from time-of-flight measurements for electrons in He and H₂. Their main objective was to refute the popular misconception that $\sigma_1 = \sigma_{2log} = 0$ [11], which arose from an inappropriate application of localization ideas to the low-density regime. Ref. [10] concluded that the existing experiments give very good agreement with the value of σ_1 given in Eq.(1b). This success raises the question whether the same system could be used to observe the logarithmic term. In the absence of information about σ_2 this would involve measuring the conductivity over a gas density range that is sufficient to observe the logarithmic dependence directly. This is clearly hopeless. However, if σ_2 was known, then the logarithmic term would just provide a weakly density dependent correction to it, and a sufficiently accurate experiment *at fixed gas density* would be sufficient to probe the existence of the logarithmic term.

In this Letter we report a calculation of σ_2 . We then put the density expansion in a form that can be directly compared with experiment, and discuss the parameter regime in which our calculation provides a sufficiently accurate description of electrons in Helium gas. We find that our results allow for an experimental check of the existence or otherwise of the logarithmic term by means of a time-of-flight experiment of the type reported in Ref. [7], provided that the experimental accuracy can be increased by about a factor of ten.

The theoretical framework for our calculation is the diagrammatic approach developed by Kirkpatrick and Dorfman [8]. This paper showed how to formulate the problem in terms of standard Edwards diagrams, and identified all diagrams that contribute to σ_1 and σ_{2log} in Eqs.(1). We have extended this calculation by identifying and calculating all diagrams that contribute to σ_2 . The complete classification and evaluation of the diagrams is rather lengthy, and will be reported elsewhere [12]. Here we restrict ourselves to a few general remarks. (1) The diagrammatic contributions to σ_2 can be separated into three classes: (i) The diagrams identified in Ref. [8] as contributing to σ_1 and σ_{2log} , which were calculated in Ref. [9], all contribute to σ_2 as well. (ii) Certain infinite resummations obtained from the previous diagrams by replacing simple impurity lines by either ordinary impurity ladders ('diffusons') or maximally crossed ladders ('Cooperons') contribute to σ_2 . (iii) A number (~ 25) of new skeleton diagrams with up to four impurity lines also contribute to σ_2 . (2) Since the electron self energy becomes momentum dependent at $O(n^2)$ it is most convenient to use the Green function in self-consistent Born approximation to construct the diagrams, as was done in Ref. [8], and to include the higher order self energy contributions explicitly. The real part of the self-consistent Born self energy, which was neglected in Ref. [8], is a constant which strictly renormalizes the chemical potential and can be neglected for our purposes as well. (3) If one works to lowest order in the small parameter $a_s k_F$ one encounters logarithmic singularities signaling a $\ln(a_s k_F)$ dependence. It is therefore necessary to use an ultraviolet cutoff momentum $Q \sim 1/a_s$ in certain integrals. The resulting $\ln Q$ dependences are all due

to the real part of the self energy. They constitute shifts of the chemical potential, and disappear if one considers the experimentally relevant mobility instead of the conductivity.

From our calculation we obtain,

$$\sigma_2 = 4 \ln(Q/k_F) + \frac{55}{36} \pi^2 - 14 \ln 2 + 7 - I_1 + I_2 - I_3 \quad , \quad (2a)$$

where $I_{1,2,3}$ are three integrals which we could not reduce to tabulated ones,

$$I_1 = \int_0^1 \frac{dx}{x} \left[\ln \left(\frac{1-x}{1+x} \right) \right]^2 = 4.207 \dots \quad , \quad (2b)$$

$$I_2 = \int_0^1 dx \, x \left[\ln \left(\frac{1-x}{1+x} \right) \right]^2 = 2.772 \dots \quad , \quad (2c)$$

$$I_3 = \frac{4}{\pi} \int_0^\infty \frac{dx}{x^2} (\arctan x)^4 / \left[1 - \frac{1}{x} \arctan x \right] = 7.716 \dots \quad . \quad (2d)$$

For the density of states a much simpler calculation yields,

$$N = N_0 \left[1 + N_2 \left(\frac{1}{2k_F l} \right)^2 + O(1/(k_F l)^3) \right] \quad , \quad (3a)$$

with $N_0 = k_F m / \pi^2 \hbar^2$ the free electron density of states, and

$$N_2 = 2 \ln(Q/k_F) - 4 \ln 2 - 1/2 \quad . \quad (3b)$$

We next convert these results into the temperature dependent mobility, which is directly measured in a time-of-flight experiment. The mobility is given by $\mu(T) = \sigma(T)/en(T)$, where $\sigma(T)$ is the temperature dependent conductivity, and $n(T)$ is the electron particle number density. $\sigma(T)$ is obtained from Eq.(1a) by means of the Kubo-Greenwood formula [13],

$$\mu(T) = \int_0^\infty d\epsilon \left(\frac{-\partial f}{\partial \epsilon} \right) \sigma(\epsilon) / e \int_0^\infty d\epsilon f(\epsilon) N(\epsilon) \quad , \quad (4)$$

with $\sigma(\epsilon)$, $N(\epsilon)$ from Eqs.(1), (3) as functions of $\epsilon = \hbar^2 k_F^2 / 2m$, and $f(\epsilon)$ the Fermi function. We are interested in the limit of small electron density where the latter can be replaced by a Boltzmann distribution, $f(\epsilon) = e^{\beta\mu} e^{-\beta\epsilon}$. Performing the integrals we obtain,

$$\mu(T)/\mu_B(T) = 1 + \mu_1 \chi + \mu_{2\log} \chi^2 \ln \chi + \mu_2 \chi^2 + O(\chi a_s / \lambda) + o(\chi^2) \quad , \quad (5a)$$

with $\chi = \lambda / \pi l = 8\pi n a_s^2 (\hbar^2 \beta / 2m)^{1/2}$, and $\mu_B(T) = 4el/3(2\pi m/\beta)^{1/2}$ the Boltzmann value for the mobility. The coefficients are,

$$\mu_1 = -\pi^{3/2}/6 \quad , \quad (5b)$$

$$\mu_{2\log} = (\pi^2 - 4)/32 \quad , \quad (5c)$$

$$\mu_2 = \frac{1}{16} \left[\frac{\pi^2}{36} (55 + 9C) - C + 8 - 10 \ln 2 - I_1 + I_2 - I_3 \right] - 2\mu_{2log} \ln 2 = 0.236 \dots \quad , \quad (5d)$$

where C is Euler's constant.

Let us discuss the relation of our result, Eqs.(5), to existing [7] and possible future experiments. The main uncertainties in this relation arise from the terms of $o(\chi^2)$ and $O(\chi a_s/\lambda)$ in Eq.(5a). The former are undoubtedly nonanalytic, but their functional form is not known, let alone their magnitude. However, to estimate their importance it is plausible to neglect the nonanalyticity, and to assume that the coefficients in the χ -expansion are all of roughly the same magnitude. In the Kubo-Greenwood integration, Eq.(4), the χ^3 -term picks up an extra factor of $\sqrt{\pi}$, and so we estimate $o(\chi^2) \approx \mu_3 \chi^3$ with $-2\sqrt{\pi}\mu_2 \lesssim \mu_3 \lesssim 2\sqrt{\pi}\mu_2$. We neglect the, presumably weak, χ -dependence of μ_3 , and allow for a safety margin in the form of an extra factor of 2. The terms of $O(\chi a_s/\lambda)$ describe excluded volume-like effects, *i.e.* they correspond to terms of $O(na_s^3)$ in the zero temperature perturbation theory. Since the temperature dependence of these terms is different from that of the leading terms it would in principle be possible to separate them experimentally. However, as long as they are small compared to the second order terms which we keep in Eq.(5a), *i.e.* as long as $\chi^2 > \chi a_s/\lambda$, or $\chi > a_s/\lambda$, they can be neglected. This means there is a window of χ -values for which the excluded volume terms are negligible, but the higher order in χ -terms are not yet important.

We now define, as a convenient quantity directly comparable with experiment,

$$f(\chi) \equiv [\mu(T)/\mu_B - 1 - \mu_1 \chi] / \chi^2 \quad . \quad (6a)$$

Our theoretical prediction for this quantity is,

$$f(\chi) = \mu_{2log} \ln \chi + \mu_2 \pm \mu_2 2\sqrt{\pi} \chi \quad , \quad (6b)$$

with μ_2 and μ_{2log} from Eqs.(5). We have omitted the error due to the excluded volume effects, since they turn out to be negligible in the parameter range that is of experimental interest. We now consider the experimental results obtained by Schwarz [7] at Helium temperature. At $T = 4.2\text{K}$, a He gas density $n = 10^{21} \text{cm}^{-3}$ corresponds to $\chi = 1$, and data were obtained for χ as low as 0.08. In Fig.1 we show the theoretical prediction, Eqs.(6), for $0 < \chi < 0.7$ together with Schwarz's data. The error bars shown assume a total error of 3% in μ/μ_B and 4% in χ . To illustrate the effect of the logarithmic term the figure also shows what the theoretical prediction would be if σ_{2log} in Eqs.(1) was zero.

From Fig.1 we draw the following conclusions. (1) The existing data are certainly consistent with the existence of the logarithmic term, but are not accurate enough to be conclusive. (2) A repetition of this experiment in the region $0.1 < \chi < 0.2$ with an accuracy improved by at least a factor of 10 would be sufficient for a convincing test of the logarithmic term's existence. This range of χ -values is particularly suitable because excluded volume effects are negligible [14]. At larger χ -values the uncertainty due to the χ^3 -terms makes the theoretical prediction meaningless, and at lower χ -values errors in determining χ translate into very large errors in $f(\chi)$. Also, the excluded volume effects become noticeable at smaller χ .

Let us finally discuss other error sources that are due to idealizations in the theoretical model. (1) Static correlations between the He atoms. This effect can be estimated, *e.g.*, from Ziman's formula [15]. It is of the same order as the excluded volume effects discussed

above. (2) Coulomb interaction effects. Ref. [7] used an electron current density $j \approx 10^{-12} Ccm^{-2}s^{-1}$. With a drift velocity $v \approx 10^4 cm/s$ this corresponds to an electron density $n_e \approx 10^3 cm^{-3}$. The Coulomb energy $E_c \approx e^2/n_e^{-1/3}$ is then less than one percent of the kinetic energy, $k_B T$. Obviously, Coulomb effects can be made even smaller by decreasing the electron density. (3) Dynamics of the He gas. During a scattering time $\tau \approx 10^{-12} s$ the thermal velocity of the He atoms leads to a displacement $d \approx 1 \text{\AA}$, which is comparable with the scattering length. The effect on the electron mobility is of order $d/\lambda \sim a_s/\lambda$, which is of the same order as the excluded volume effects.

In summary, we have calculated the coefficient of the analytic term at second order in the density expansion for the mobility in a quantum Lorentz model. We have argued that this model yields a realistic description of electrons in He gas, and that our calculation provides the information necessary for a convincing experimental observation of the logarithmic term in the density expansion. A discussion of the experimental accuracy necessary to achieve this, and of a suitable parameter range, has been given.

We gratefully acknowledge helpful discussions with P.W.Adams and J.V.Sengers. One of us (KIW) is grateful for the warm hospitality extended to him at the University of Oregon. This work was supported by the NSF under grant numbers DMR-92-17496 and DMR-92-09879.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. R. Dorfman and E. G. D. Cohen, Phys. Lett. **16**, 124 (1965).
- [2] R. Peierls, *Surprises in Theoretical Physics*, Princeton University (Princeton 1979), ch. 5.1.
- [3] J. S. Langer and T. Neal, Phys. Rev. Lett. **16**, 984 (1966).
- [4] For a recent review, see, J. R. Dorfman, T. R. Kirkpatrick, and J. V. Sengers, *Generic Long-Range Correlations in Molecular Fluids*, to appear in Annual Reviews of Physical Chemistry.
- [5] C. Bruin, Physica **72**, 261 (1974).
- [6] see, e.g., P. A. Lee and T. V. Ramakrishnan, Rev. Mod. Phys. **57**, 287 (1985).
- [7] K. Schwarz, Phys. Rev. B **21**, 5125 (1980).
- [8] T. R. Kirkpatrick and J. R. Dorfman, Phys. Rev. A **28**, 1022 (1983). See also Ref. [9] which corrected an algebraic error in the results of this paper.
- [9] T. R. Kirkpatrick and D. Belitz, Phys. Rev. B **34**, 2168 (1986).
- [10] P. W. Adams, D. A. Browne, and M. A. Paalanen, Phys. Rev. B **45**, 8837 (1992).
- [11] See, *e.g.*, N. F. Mott *Metal-Insulator Transitions*, Taylor&Francis (London 1990) ch.1.14.
- [12] K. I. Wysokinski, Wansoo Park, D. Belitz, and T. R. Kirkpatrick, unpublished.
- [13] D. A. Greenwood, Proc. Phys. Soc. **71**, 585 (1958).
- [14] $a_s/\lambda \approx 10^{-3}$ at $4.2K$, and the prefactor can be estimated from classical Enskog theory, or from the exactly known result for the classical Lorentz model, J. M. J. van Leeuwen and A. Weyland, Physica **36**, 457 (1967). For $0.1 \lesssim \chi \lesssim 0.2$ one finds the uncertainty due to excluded volume effects to be smaller than the one due to μ_3 .
- [15] J. M. Ziman, Phil. Mag. **6**, 1013 (1961).

FIGURES

FIG. 1. The reduced mobility f , as defined in Eq.(6a), vs. the density parameter $\chi = \lambda/\pi l$. The theoretical prediction is for f to lie between the two solid lines. The experimental data are from Fig.9 of Ref. [7] with error bars estimated as described in the text. The broken lines show what the theoretical prediction would be in the absence of the logarithmic term in the density expansion.